REMARKS

The above amendment with the following remarks is submitted to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action of March 27, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in light of the amendment and the allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 11-17 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. In response to the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, and 11-17 have been amended. In addition, new claims 18-24 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-9 and 11-24 are now pending in the present application and are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Referring now to the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the previously cited U.S. Patent No. 5,740,425 to Povilus and U.S. Patent application publication US 2003/0130905 to Foster et al., in view of a newly cited U.S. Patent No. 7,107,226 to Cassidy et al. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Povilus discloses all of the limitations of the numerous claims except value lists that minimize potential error which is asserted to be disclosed in the Foster reference. The Examiner further asserts that the newly cited Cassidy et al. reference discloses a plurality of predetermined user selectable values. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the invention is unpatentable. The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, the cited references to Povilus, Foster et al., and Cassidy et al., even in combination, still fails to disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the invention as claimed. In particular, as explained in the previously submitted Amendment, the cited portions of Povilus describe different classes or groupings of products having differing attributes, but does not describe possible value lists having a plurality of values as claimed in the present invention, and also does not disclose the various other limitations of the dependent claims. The Examiner's characterization in the present Office Action of what the Povilus patent discloses is clearly improper, and the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's assertions as to the features disclosed by the Povilus patent.

The cited secondary Foster et al. reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary Povilus reference in that, as noted in the prior Amendment, the Foster reference merely discloses pull down type menus with nesting sub-menus for identifying a product in an existing catalog. However, Foster et al. fails to disclose a system for facilitating inputting and storing product data into a database that utilizes value lists that have a plurality of predetermined, user selectable values that are selected as a value for an attribute to thereby minimize potential error. The identified information in the menus disclosed in Foster et al. are attributes of the products, and not values for the attributes that are inputted and stored during capturing of product data for a catalog. Thus, the values for the attributes are disclosed in Foster et al. as being already present in the system, and are not selectively entered by the user into a database. Correspondingly, as previously noted, the values for the attributes are disclosed as being entered by the user using the product editor, or being automatically provided by a table. No user selectable value lists having a plurality of values are disclosed in the Foster et al. reference.

The newly cited third reference to Cassidy et al. reference fails to fully cure the deficiencies of the combination of the above described primary Povilus reference and the secondary reference to Foster et al. It is noted that the Examiner fails to establish any reason for modifying the system of Povilus and or Foster et al. with the system of Cassidy et al. In addition, it is noted that Cassidy et al. reference is generally directed to an on-line comparison shopping system and method for purchasing products. Thus, like Foster et al., Cassidy et al. discloses a system with pull down type menus for identifying a product in an existing catalog. However, Cassidy et al. fails to disclose a system for facilitating inputting and storing product data into a database that utilizes value lists that have a plurality of predetermined, user selectable values that are selected as a value for an attribute during inputting and storing of the product data. Whereas, Cassidy et al. does disclose a mechanism for adding data to the shopping system where existing entries are displayed for the user, the disclosed added data is merely a subcategory of a selected category, and is not values for an attribute of a product that is being classified as specifically recited in the rejected claims.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that even if there was motivation to modify Povilus with Foster et al. and Cassidy et al., such combination still does not result in a

system with value lists recited in independent claim 1, and does not render the present invention unpatentable as asserted by the Examiner. The combination of these cited references merely disclose a system that allows the user to identify a product in an existing database using drop down menus, and allows manual entry of values (not selection of predetermined values) or selection of a sub-category (not a value for an attribute). The remaining rejected claims ultimately dependent on claim 1 all specifically recite plurality of possible value lists that identify plurality of values which are selectable as a value for the attribute of the product. Correspondingly, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-9 and 11-17 is believed to be improper, and the withdrawal thereof is hereby requested.

As explained during the personal interview, the present invention is directed to method and apparatus for capturing product data by inputting and storing product data into a database. This stored product data can then be utilized in an electronic product catalog. In contrast, it is again noted that the cited prior art references are generally directed to existing product catalogs, and interfaces that allow the user to identify the desired product within the existing catalog. The prior art references do provide a mechanism for editing or adding to the product data in the existing catalog, but not in the manner recited in the present claims which specifically recite the use of value lists with a plurality of selectable values that are selectable as a value for an attribute of the product.

In addition, the Applicants again note that Povilus fails to disclose the features asserted by the Examiner in the Office Action relative to the rejection of the various dependent claims. In particular, dependent claims 2 and 3 recites a plurality of possible unit lists that identify units which are selectable as a unit for an attribute of the product being classified. The cited portions of Povilus relied upon by the Examiner in the Office Action do not relate to units at all. Dependent claim 4 recites a multi-value indicator that indicates more than one value can be selected. The cited portions of Povilus relied upon by the Examiner do not relate to such an indicator at all. Dependent claim 5 recites a data capture priority indicator. The cited portions of Povilus do not relate to a priority indicator. Dependent claim 6 recites a countries table that specify selectable countries. Relevance of the Examiner's cited portions of Povilus is entirely unclear. Dependent claim 7 recites a compatibility table that sets for selectable platforms which are compatible

with the specific product. Again, the relevance of the Examiner's cited portions of Povilus is entirely unclear.

It is entirely unclear how the cited portions of the Povilus reference disclose any of the above noted features as asserted by the Examiner in the Office Action. If the Examiner is to continue to rely upon Povilus for any further rejections, the Applicants again respectfully request that the basis of the Examiner's assertions as to the teachings of Povilus, and how they are applicable to the recited limitations of each of the independent and dependent claims, be made explicitly clear.

However, to further expedite the prosecution of the present application, independent claim 1 has been again amended to more clearly define the invention. In this regard, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the data structure of the database is for use in capturing product data by inputting and storing the product data in the database, that the class definitions identify associated categories of products, and that the category definition identify an attribute group for a product category. Furthermore, independent claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the plurality of value lists facilitate input and storage of product data into the database, and that the user selectable values are selectable during input and storage of product data as a value for an attribute of a product that is being classified and stored in the database. Dependent claims 2, 4, 6, and 7 have also been amended to more clearly define the invention claimed, and to better correspond with the now amended independent claim 1.

Referring again to the Office Action, independent claim 8 was also rejected based on Povilus, in combination with Foster et al. and Cassidy et al. discussed above. However, the above comments relative to independent claim 1 is believed to be equally applicable here in that claim 8 also recites that each attribute have an associated possible value list having a plurality of values that are selectable as a value for the associated attribute of a product classified.

In addition, independent claim 8 also recites a plurality of system SKUs, each system SKU being arranged to identify one of the plurality of products and a plurality of manufacturer SKUs, each manufacturer SKU being associated with one of the plurality of system SKUs. Moreover, claim 8 further recites a customer mapping table that maps each system SKU to a customer SKU. It is again noted that in contrast to the Examiner's

assertions, the cited Povilus reference fails to disclose these features. Whereas a product SKU is disclosed in Povilus, the other recited limitations are clearly not disclosed, including system SKUs and a customer mapping table. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection, and the allowance of independent claim 8 and dependent claims 9, and 11-17 ultimately dependent thereon, are also requested.

However, to expedite the prosecution of the present application, independent claim 8 has also been amended in a manner similar to that noted relative to independent claim 1 to more clearly define the present invention.

Finally, new claims 18-24 have also been added by the above Amendment, these claims generally corresponding to claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-17, but reworded to recite a system for capturing product data including a database with a data structure based on a data model, and a data capture tool. The Examination and allowance of these claims are also respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. However, if any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Song
Registration No. 43,143

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000
(202) 585-8080 (Fax)
Customer No. 22204

Dated: June 27, 2007

10620089.1